



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/733,617	12/11/2003	Ming-qun Xu	NEB-214-US	9524
28986 7590 02/29/2008 HARRIET M. STRIMPEL; NEW ENGLAND BIOLABS, INC. 240 COUNTY ROAD IPSWICH, MA 01938-2723				
EXAMINER				
VENCJ, DAVID J				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1641				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/29/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/733,617

Applicant(s)

XU ET AL.

Examiner

DAVID J. VENCI

Art Unit

1641

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) DJ Venci (USPTO).(3) Tom Evans (Applicant).(2) Long V. Le (USPTO).(4) Ming Xu (Applicant).

Date of Interview: February 8, 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: of record.

Identification of prior art discussed: of record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: _____.

With respect to Figure 1, specifically, the second chitin bead from the top of Figure 1, Applicant Tom Evans acknowledged what appears to be a C-terminal thioester attached to the chitin bead. Applicants' observation appears consistent with the teachings of Cantor & Chong, 22 Protein Expr. Purif. 135 (2001), who also teach the pre-existence of C-terminal thioesters prior to nucleophilic attack by 2-mercaptoethanesulfonic acid.

Attorney Harriet Strimpel reiterated arguments made in Applicants' reply filed November 30, 2007, After Final Office Action.

Examiners agreed to reconsider Dr. Strimpel's arguments. However, upon further reconsideration, it was principally determined that claims 1-8 are NOT in condition for allowance.

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Long Le/

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required